

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

This responds to the Restriction Requirement mailed March 3, 2009 in the above application.

In response to the rejection of claim 30, the claim has been cancelled.


In response to the Restriction Requirement, Applicant elects Group I, claims 1-10 and 31-35.

The Restriction Requirement is respectfully traversed. It is noted that each group of claims includes in it claim 1. Claim 1 is generic to all of the groups of claims. If claim 1 or another claim is found to be generic to all the groups of claims, then the various groups of claims define separate species or embodiments of claim 1 or another generic claim, rather than separate inventions. If claim 1 or another generic claim is found allowable, that generic, broad claim in every Group would have the same technical feature and only differ as to the particular embodiment thereof. It is requested that the Restriction Requirement be modified to a Species Election Requirement and that the first Group be deemed a first Group of claims to an elected species. As this is a Species Election Requirement, rejoinder of all the claims during examination would be warranted if a claim generic to all species were found allowable.

THIS CORRESPONDENCE IS BEING
SUBMITTED ELECTRONICALLY
THROUGH THE PATENT AND
TRADEMARK OFFICE EFS FILING
SYSTEM ON August 21, 2009.

RCF:ksb

Respectfully submitted,



Robert C. Faber
Registration No.: 24,322
OSTROLENK FABER LLP
1180 Avenue of the Americas
New York, New York 10036-8403
Telephone: (212) 382-0700